

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 22, 36, 55, 61, and 67 have been amended. Claims 5, 27, 41, 56, 57, and 71 have been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-13, 22, 24-26, 28-36, 38-40, 42, 43, 54, 55, 58-70, and 72 are pending in the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-13, 54, 55-66, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 55 have been amended to address the concerns raised in the Office Action. Specifically, the phrase “functions like an extra hard drive” has been changed to “functions as an extra memory storage device.” Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-13, 22, 24-43, 54, and 67-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because the Office Action states that the term “processing system” is overbroad. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action has not set forth a deficiency in the claim that renders the claim indefinite. The mere fact that a claim is broad does not render the claim indefinite. Further, in light of the Office Action’s statement that the term “processing system” is described in the specification, it is unclear why the Office Action considers the term to be indefinite. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9-13, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 54-68, 70, 71, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,149,511 ("Bachner"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "said transmitter/receiver circuit automatically establishing a wireless communications path with a processing system when within a vicinity of the processing system, which vicinity is sufficient to establish said wireless communications path." Bachner does not disclose this feature. The Office Action states that Bachner teaches this limitation at column 5, lines 17-24, column 6, lines 6-8, and column 8, lines 34-67. While Bachner does disclose that a "transfer of digital data...may be over a wireless connection," Bachner does not disclose that a radio wave communications path is automatically established, as recited by claim 1.

Claim 55, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "a processor system comprising a recharger for detachably receiving and recharging thereat a portable memory module having a rechargeable power supply." Bachner does not disclose this feature.

Since Bachner does not disclose all the limitations of claims 1 and 55, claims 1 and 55 are not anticipated by Bachner. Claims 22, 36, and 67 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Claims 4, 9-13, 54, and 72 depend from claim 1 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 38, 40, and 43 depend from claim 36 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 58-60 depend from claim 55 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 62-66 depend from claim 61 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 68-70 depend

from claim 67 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 3, 6, 39, 42, and 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachner in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0049262 ("Lehtonen"). Claims 22 and 24-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachner in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0095538 ("Marshall"). Claims 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachner in view of Lehtonen and Marshall. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least because Bachner in view of Lehtonen and Marshall, even if properly combinable, do not teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 22, 36, 55, 61, and 67 as discussed above. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Furthermore, Lehtonen and Marshall do not cure the deficiencies of Bachner with respect to the independent claims. Since Bachner, Lehtonen, and Marshall do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 22, 36, 55, 61, and 67, these claims, and the claims that depend on them, are not obvious over the cited references.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

David T. Beck

Registration No.: 54,985

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant